



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

AN ENGLISH VIEW OF IRISH SECESSION.

THOUGH a young member of the Whig party, I will venture to speak in the name of the whole body. I tell the honourable and learned gentleman that the same spirit which sustained us in a just contest for him, will sustain us in an equally just contest against him. Calumny, abuse, royal displeasure, popular fury, exclusion from office, exclusion from Parliament, we were ready to endure them all rather than that he should be less than a British subject. We never will suffer him to be more.

These are the words of Lord Macaulay in his great speech on the motion for the repeal of the Union in reply to O'Connell. They may fairly be taken as a summary of the position which the Unionist party in Great Britain occupies at the present day. In 1889, the Queen's subjects resident in Ireland possess the benefits which Macaulay and his colleagues fought to secure to them; in other words, they enjoy the full liberty of the freest political community in the universe. All that the law of England bestows upon Englishmen is bestowed upon Irishmen. There is, however, a political party which desires to put an end to this equality of conditions and which desires to make Irishmen both less and more than British subjects.

As in 1861-65 the North fought to the bitter end to preserve the unity of the American republic, so in England there is a party no less determined to do what in it lies to preserve the integrity of the United Kingdom. It is with the hope that I may be able to lay before American readers, however imperfectly, the reasons which guide the Unionist party in England to the conclusions which they have adopted, that I have availed myself of the opportunity which has been afforded me to make a brief statement of the Unionist view of the situation.

I shall not attempt in my summary of the arguments to derive any advantage from considerations which are not and can-

not be readily apprehended by strangers. I shall endeavor, as far as possible, to deal with logical sequences based on matters of public record, and with which any reader of political literature can easily make himself familiar. Citizens of the United States are sufficiently occupied with their own domestic problems to be fully dispensed from the duty of acquainting themselves with the details of British domestic politics; and if the acquiescence and sympathy of Americans are to be obtained by those who are working out the fate of England at one of the most critical moments of her history, it must be by stating the problem in the broadest possible terms, and by appealing to admitted facts and to logically sound reasoning based upon the simplest and clearest premises. The necessity for keeping strictly within these limitations is not without its compensations for the Englishman who essays to state his case, for it compels him to formulate his own ideas with exactness, to separate that which is adventitious from that which is essential, and to examine the arguments by which his own conclusions have been so often supported.

The Two Parties.

Having said so much with regard to the spirit in which I desire to treat the problem which has been set before me, I am anxious that I should not be taken to mean that the "personal equation" does not in any way affect my own conduct and the convictions and conduct of many of my countrymen. It is impossible to refrain from weighing heads as well as counting them; and I should be utterly failing to do justice to that great body of my countrymen whose views I share and whose cause I am anxious faithfully to represent, were I to make no mention of the character and composition of the two parties into which the United Kingdom is now so unhappily divided. There is no greater source of consolation and encouragement to the adherents of the Union than the fact that wherever they look, to whatever rank, profession or calling they turn, they find that, with rare exceptions, the men and women who before the raising of this Home-rule question would unhesitatingly have

been named as the fittest representatives of what was most honorable, most instructed and most capable in their several callings, are now for almost the first time in English history to be found united in political thought.

To know that numbers are on our side at the present moment is of course satisfactory. But the shifting balance of the electorate is not a thing which can excite the imagination, any more than it can impress the judgment. To know that 100,000 more or less uninformed persons voted black at one election, and will therefore, for the sake of a pleasing variety and in pursuance of that law which seems to govern all popular elections, probably vote white at the next, is interesting, and, in view of the fact that this "upset" party has the power to wreck the constitution of the country, to break up the Empire, or to commit any other vagary of that kind, is in its way important enough. But as the defection of such a contingent cannot alter by one hair's breadth a sane man's conviction as to the wisdom or folly of the course which it may compel the country to adopt, so on the other hand the mere fact of its support is incapable of creating or sustaining any sort of enthusiasm for or against a particular course of action.

It is the fortunate privilege of the Unionist party in Great Britain to have a deeper and sounder inspiration; and it is the consciousness which its members feel that, whatever be the immediate result of their efforts, they are fighting on the side of all that is best in their country, that all which is honorable and of good report is with them,—it is this consciousness that has turned a political campaign into an earnest and enthusiastic struggle in which those who take part believe they are fighting for all that makes political life endurable and national life honorable.

I am quite aware that, in saying this, I am making an assertion which it is impossible to substantiate in the limits of a magazine article. There are no doubt many citizens of the United States whose acquaintance with English life will enable them to endorse or to take issue upon my statement; and it is my impression that of these Americans very few are likely to

contradict me. But I readily admit that no such *ex parte* statement as this of mine ought to have any great weight with those who are unable to verify its correctness.

At the same time, it is surely permissible to ask any American reader to mark with attention the way in which the existing division of parties was brought about. That suddenly and without the slightest warning the foremost politician in the country should not only have abandoned the principles which he had hitherto professed, but the methods which he had previously on all occasions adopted, is a remarkable fact. That not content with abandoning the policy which for fifty years he had defended and pursued, he should have entered upon a violent crusade in favor of a policy which was not only inconsistent with, but which was in direct contradiction to that which had been relinquished, is a singular phenomenon. Nor is its singularity diminished by the fact that the zeal of the converted politician has not only led him to enforce his new-found doctrines with the utmost vigor, but has compelled him to disavow and to denounce almost every principle and profession by which he had acquired his high position.

Sudden political conversions, it is true, are not uncommon; but there are circumstances connected with Mr. Gladstone's *volte-face* which are not as ordinary and conventional as the manœuvre itself. That, with exceptions which may be numbered on the fingers of one hand, every important colleague of the minister should have declined to follow his lead, and should have preferred to risk (and in many cases to sacrifice) the present enjoyment and the future hope of political power, is not a conventional incident of a political crisis. Even outside their own country the names of some of these men are familiar as stanch and life-long supporters of that liberal creed of which Mr. Gladstone now claims to be the sole exponent. Mr. Bright, Mr. Chamberlain, Sir H. James, the Duke of Argyll, and Lord Selborne are among the number; and if their followers among the Liberal Unionist party are unknown in America, they are none the less men who for many a year have fought the battle of liberalism without a stain upon their scutcheon.

Again, the mere fact that ex-ministers and privy councillors should be in direct and most friendly alliance with men who have earned the whole of their reputation by persistent attempts to ruin and disgrace this country, and should feel it part of their duty to defend and even to clothe with power individuals whom, up to within a few months, they had overwhelmed with the most tremendous charges of dishonesty, cruelty and treason, is a peculiar and interesting example of the strange incidents of political life in a democratic country.

I am quite aware that all these circumstances combined fail to constitute a conclusive argument. At the same time, the phenomena which have been described are in themselves so remarkable and indicate so severe a disturbance of the normal conditions of political life, that they may fairly claim careful and honest investigation. The issue which can have produced so sudden and so marked a divergence of opinion, which can have prompted such serious sacrifices on the part of the various persons affected by it, is not one which any human being, whether he be a subject of the Queen or not, has the right to settle off-hand, without a full and respectful hearing of the case on both sides. There is every reason to believe that one side of the case, that which is supported by Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Parnell in England, by Mr. Patrick Ford and Mr. Egan in America, is not likely to suffer from want of frequent and impassioned advocacy in the United States. But that the other side of the question has been put with equal vigor, or has been listened to with equal respect and attention, does not seem by any means clear.

I am desirous, as far as it is in my power, to convince American readers that a cause which has for its objects the maintenance of the Union, the supremacy of our Parliament, the enforcement of our laws, the protection of our fellow subjects, and the observance of our plighted word, is one which merits their sympathy and is entitled to command their respect.

I hope to show them that in fighting against Gladstonian Home Rule we are striving, not for a party advantage or a

political triumph, but are contending for those principles of of national unity, national honesty, and national duty which are no less dear to us than they have always been to the people of the United States.

What is Home Rule?

Having said so much, and made it clear that there is in the United Kingdom a party important in numbers, influential as regards the character of its members, animated by an enthusiastic belief in its cause and confident that both reason and duty combine to point out its course; having shown that this party, which contains within it representatives of every section of political opinion in these islands, is united in its determination to resist to the very last the policy of Home Rule for Ireland, as proposed by Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Parnell,—it becomes necessary to go a little into detail, and to explain, in the first place, what it is against which the Unionist party is fighting, and what are the reasons, whether in morals, logic or expediency, upon which it bases its action.

It may seem a somewhat remarkable admission, but at the same time it is a fact, that the first portion of this duty is not an easy one for a Unionist to carry out satisfactorily. To define the precise danger against which we are at this moment contending is indeed, under existing circumstances, exceedingly difficult, and it is not hard to understand why this is the case. Two years ago Mr. Gladstone, being at the time in office, did, as all the world knows, propound a definite scheme of Home Rule for Ireland, the main feature of which was the creation of a separate Irish legislature and which contained a multitude of subordinate provisions by which a working constitution was to be secured between Great Britain and Ireland. At that period there was certainly no room for doubt as to the exact nature of the policy which was proposed. The whole scheme by which the British constitution was to be destroyed was to be found within the four corners of Mr. Gladstone's bill. Fully aware of the nature of the demand which was made upon them, the electors found no difficulty whatever in

giving to it a prompt and categorical negative ; and the rejection of the bill in the House of Commons was followed by the return to Parliament of a party pledged to oppose Mr. Gladstone's policy, and endowed with a working majority of over 100 votes. The decided nature of the popular verdict is remarkable enough even when it is thus stated ; but it becomes even more striking when we remember that, if we eliminate the Irish members, the majority in Great Britain was no less than 181, while in England itself only 150 out of a total of 495 members were returned to support the Home-rule bill.

That any community claiming the slightest reputation for political common sense should have refused to accept the proposals contained in Mr. Gladstone's bill, is not indeed surprising ; and it is hardly open to doubt that, were the same measure proposed again, it would meet with a similar fate. But at the present moment the state of affairs is very different from what it was in 1886. Relieved from the painful necessity of rigid definition, Mr. Gladstone and his principal adherents have substituted for the cut and dried clauses of a bill an infinity of vague and often contradictory generalities, which do duty, according to the nature of the audience to be addressed and the immediate object to be gained, as the principles upon which their new and amended scheme of Home Rule is to be based.

It is no exaggeration whatever to say that there is not a single person in the United Kingdom, with the very doubtful exception of Mr. Gladstone himself, who has the slightest conception as to what Gladstonian Home Rule in its present phase actually means or involves.

It is of course perfectly obvious that the very first result of Mr. Gladstone's return to power would be that he and his new ally, Mr. Parnell, would be called upon to formulate another scheme, which, while it avoided the errors of the old one, should succeed in satisfying the various parties who would be entitled to be heard. It is possible for the members of the Unionist party to anticipate with a tolerably tranquil mind this critical moment. Meanwhile, however, the Irish party, exercis-

ing the fortunate privilege of irresponsible opposition, are careful to follow the scriptural precept of being "all things to all men." And, inasmuch as under the present conditions there is no difficulty whatever in promising to every member of the party, from the Englishman who desires to give more power to an Irish vestry to the Fenian who longs for the destruction of England and the triumph of the Irish republic, precisely what each desires, it is not hard to beat up recruits or to arouse enthusiasm. But though it be impossible, for the reasons above stated, that any member of the Unionist party should describe precisely the danger by which the country is confronted, there can be no doubt at all that every motive which actuated him in 1886 must affect him even more powerfully at the present moment.

In 1886 it was possible to read in black and white the whole injury which was to be inflicted upon the United Kingdom. In 1889 that concise catalogue of perils has been replaced by a vague but enormously increased list of menaces. But whatever be vague, this is certain: that whatever change there has been in the attitude and intentions of the Gladstonian party has been for the worse. Since 1886 Mr. Gladstone has entered into a deliberate and open alliance with men, all of whom have been animated by, and many of whom still express, deep hatred for this country. Faith plighted to Mr. Parnell and to Mr. Parnell's supporters must be redeemed, and the price for services rendered must be paid. Day by day and year by year, the departure of the Gladstonian party from the better traditions of English parliamentary life has become more and more apparent; and English members who have been compelled to suit their conduct to that of the most notorious parliamentary bravos of our time have naturally undergone a marked degradation in their efforts to be at home with their new friends. To be "hail fellow well met" with men who, to use Mr. Bright's phrase, "make it their object to insult and to degrade the Imperial Parliament," necessitates an abandonment of most of the happier traditions of English public life. For these reasons, therefore, Unionists cannot fail to view with increasing

alarm the prospect presented to them, if ever the two sections of the Gladstonian-Parnellite party should be in a position to carry out their mutual compacts and arrangements at the expense of the country.

Having said so much with regard to the position of the Unionist party and the motives which compel it to be more than ever on its guard, I shall now state, as briefly and as concisely as I can, why it is that the Unionist party in the United Kingdom objects *in toto* to the Gladstonian policy of Home Rule, whether it be the definite scheme of 1886 or the less defined but more dangerous policy of 1889. I desire to point out to American readers that the grounds upon which we object to this policy are broad grounds of morality, reason and common sense; that the dangers which we seek to avoid are those which Americans themselves have experienced, against which they have fought resolutely in the past, and against which they would fight with equal resolution in the future.

The Federal Argument.

The whole argument in favor of Home Rule for Ireland is built up of a series of catchwords specially adapted to the taste of the various classes and persons to whom they are respectively addressed. There are two or three such catchwords which are specially adapted to the American market; and there is some evidence that the inventors have done a considerable business in this very spurious article. "Why should not England adopt a principle which is the very basis of the constitution of the United States?" "Why should England fear to accept a system which has been the salvation of America?" The merit of this particular catchword is that it contains not only one, but a dozen fallacies of the first order.

To begin with, it is scarcely necessary to recall the fact that the federal constitution of the United States is an organization brought into existence with the express object of joining that which was apart, not of separating that which was already one. On entering the Union each state surrendered a portion

of that which it already possessed: it did not force from the nation a concession of autonomy which it had never before enjoyed. The American Union is the bringing together of a people. Parnellite Home Rule is to be the first step towards the disintegration of a nation.

But setting aside what may by some be held to be merely an abstract view, let me come to a closer examination of what this federalism which is offered to Great Britain really means; and when I have shown its true nature I will ask: Who is there in America who would permit his own country to be insulted by a similar proposition?

Let me explain what the Parnellite scheme, translated into American values, really means. Let me suppose that at the close of the war of 1861-65, and as a means of escape from the difficulties of reconstruction, it had been suggested to the people of the United States that they should reform their constitution upon the following basis. The Northern states east of the Mississippi and the Southern states on the Atlantic seaboard to enter into a federal compact. The United States Congress to be made up of representatives from both these groups. The United States Congress to make all federal appointments, to direct the foreign policy of the Union, and to control the United States army and navy. The representatives of the Southern states to have a voice in the settlement of all the domestic affairs of the Northern states, and to be enabled to prevent any useful legislation for purely local purposes. On the other hand, a second Congress to be elected in the Southern states, under the presidency of Jefferson Davis. No American other than an inhabitant of the Southern states on the Atlantic seaboard to elect to or to be a member of this Congress, to which should be entrusted, with a few statutory exceptions, absolute control over the lives and fortunes of every man in these states, including the loyal mountaineers of Western Virginia. The United States Congress, so called, to have no right or title to interfere with the internal affairs of these Southern states, save a nominal right, reserved in certain fixed cases, and enforceable only by marching federal

troops into the country. The Southern Congress to have the right to reintroduce slavery, to pass resolutions in favor of secession and generally to "make it hot"¹ for any loyalist left within the limits of the Southern states. The security for the perpetual observance of the conditions agreed upon between the Congress of the United States and the representatives of the South, to be the verbal undertaking of the leading members of the Ku-Klux-Klan. The federal scheme so provided not to include states other than those mentioned; *i.e.* all the states west of the Mississippi and all the Southern states lying away from the Atlantic coast to be without representation in the United States Congress.

Such a constitution would doubtless strike an American as grotesque; but it is a serious and well-considered plan as compared with that which England is invited to accept as a federal solution of her difficulties with Ireland. A federal union, forsooth, is to be created, in which the federating parties are to be Great Britain on the one side and, on the other, one of the least important and least competent portions of the British Empire, inhabited by some 5,000,000 persons, two-thirds of whom boast that they desire nothing more than the ruin of England. These two high contracting parties are to administer the interests of the British Empire. A federal union, in which neither Canada, Australia, New Zealand, the Cape nor India is to be heard, is to be formed between Great Britain and the adherents of Mr. Parnell. Nor is this the whole of this monstrous jest. Already greatly over-represented in the Imperial Parliament, Ireland is to maintain in that assembly the whole of her present power for evil. The Parnellites and their successors are still to have the right to thwart, insult and degrade the operations of the House of Commons. But in Ireland they are to have another Parliament of their own, with which, save on certain special points, the Parliament of the United Kingdom is to have nothing to do. The authors of boycotting and the "plan of campaign" are to have a fair field and no favor for carrying out their enterprises in Ireland, whether it be in loyal Ulster

¹ Mr. Parnell's phrase.

or in rebel Cork ; and neither England, Scotland nor Wales is to say them nay. Then, when they please, these same men are to flock across the channel ; to tax England and Scotland ; to throw the weight of the Roman Catholic vote into the scale in questions which concern Protestant Scotland ; and to harass and interfere with a population which has abandoned all control over their actions and their conduct.

This is the travesty of federalism which is offered by the Parnellite party.

But, it will be said, it is impossible that any practical difficulties can arise from the confusion of functions between the Imperial and the subordinate legislatures. A sharp line of definition will be drawn by statute which neither side will be able to disregard or to pass over. As to the mere theoretical possibility of laying down such a line, it has been well said by Mr. Gladstone that it is a "task which passes the wit of man to accomplish." But if the theoretical division be difficult, what is to be said of the practical working of a system based upon any such scheme? Let it be remembered that in the United States there exists not only a written constitution, devised with extraordinary skill, consecrated by the consent of the nation and the custom of a century, but **that there** is also that unique and splendid tribunal, the Supreme Court. In that court are decided the issues arising between the different states of the federal Union ; and the decisions of the court are enforced by the moral and material weight of the entire Union. In Mr. Gladstone's bill, a sort of parody of the United States Supreme Court seemed to be suggested. Questions concerning the interpretation of the federal constitution were to be referred to the judicial committee of the Privy Council, reinforced by Irish judges. But the proposal to make the ancient Parliament of England subsidiary to a brand-new court of lawyers aroused such opposition that the defenders of the bill hastened to explain that the decisions of this tribunal were not to be binding upon Parliament. By their own interpretation of their own measure, accordingly, nothing equivalent to the Supreme Court was to be established ; but none the less the necessity which

created the Supreme Court in the United States would arise with equal force in the present case. The Parliament at Westminster and the Parliament at Dublin would constantly be at issue as to the exact limits of their respective prerogatives. The decision could, in the long run, rest only with the stronger or the more determined of the two disputants; and the judgment could only be enforced by the movement of troops and the use of ball cartridge.

Nor is the Supreme Court the only political institution in the United States which this country has reason to regard with a feeling of envy. The provision of the American constitution which guards against an alteration in the fundamental laws of the Union by the vote of a bare majority has no counterpart in the United Kingdom. It is impossible to exaggerate the danger which results from the absence of any such safeguard in an uninstructed and emotional democracy, crowded into the small area of these islands, and liable to be moved by a single wave of sentiment to a degree unknown in the more complex political society of America. At the present moment issues of the most vital importance, involving for good or for evil the whole future of this country, are liable to be decided from day to day by the shifting of scarcely one per cent of the population. It is neither remarkable nor discreditable that some hundred thousand persons should be found in the United Kingdom whose so-called opinions on any given subject are liable to be formed by the merest trifles, by the turn of a peroration or the cut of a man's clothes, by some piece of lying tittle-tattle or some personal bias of the most ludicrous kind. On the contrary, it would be strange if a certain number of such persons could not be found in any country. But that the chameleon changes of this little band should be allowed, without appeal, without time for reflection or opportunity for review, to reverse the whole current of English history, to compromise the safety of the country, and to destroy the constitution which it has taken a thousand years to construct, is nothing short of a calamity.

The Historical Argument.

It is a mistake to suppose that the concession of Home Rule is made either inevitable or desirable by the history of the past relations between England and Ireland. Nothing, indeed, can be more damaging to the Parnellite cause than an impartial inquiry into the historical arguments by which it is supposed to be justified. It is hardly necessary to return once more to the old fallacy that, in creating an Irish legislature, England will be restoring a condition of things which existed at some previous time. For a few brief years, it is true, there did exist a Parliament in Dublin, elected by Protestant voters and composed of Protestant members, most of them nominees of the English government, and almost without exception chosen from the landlord class. If that be the Parliament which it is thought desirable to restore, it is unfortunate that no one should ever have formulated the demand. Having succeeded in involving the country in hopeless turmoil and discord, Grattan's Parliament happily disappeared; and no responsible person has ever sought to recreate it.

In the same sense the cry of "Ireland a nation once more" is a mere catchword. Ireland never was a nation; it is even true to say that the Irish never possessed a nationality. Celt, Norman, Saxon and Scot have all found a home in the island; but never, from the time of Brian Boru downwards, could it be pretended for an instant that this heterogeneous collection of races acquired the attributes or exhibited the qualities of a nation. Every trace of organization of unity of common life which Ireland exhibits is directly and exclusively the gift of English or Scotch civilization. The parish, the barony, the county, the province of the present day are all the creations, not of the Irish nation, but of the invaders who imposed order upon the wrangling tribes of natives. The Tipperary peasant, the Dublin tradesman, the Ulster operative trace back their origin to England or to Scotland, to the Ironsides of Cromwell's army, to the colonists of the Pale, to the plantation of Ulster. That these divers elements may some day form a nation is conceiva-

ble ; to contend that they are a nation at present, or that they ever formed one in the past, is a palpable contradiction of self-evident facts.

There is perhaps no argument in the historical armory of the Parnellite party which is more frequently resorted to than that which rests upon the supposed brutality and injustice of English rule in Ireland. In strict logic it must be admitted that, granting the whole contention, it is not easy to see how the position is strengthened. Granted that, in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, England, without any excuse and out of sheer wanton brutality, harried, oppressed and persecuted Ireland, it by no means follows that either Ireland or England will necessarily be benefited by the severing of a connection which, for three-fourths of a century at least, has admittedly been marked by the most generous and friendly conduct on the part of the stronger country towards the weaker. The mere fact that General Ireton took measures against Irish rebels in the seventeenth century no more *proves* that Ireland should become a nation, than the fact that General Hoche crushed the rising in the Vendée in 1793 proves that a Norman parliament ought to be sitting at Rouen.

But it is possible to admit a great deal too much in this connection ; and for my part I am no admirer of that cheap form of humility which consists in allowing judgment to go by default against one's country simply because it pleases certain persons to attack it, and because the accusations relate to transactions which took place a long time ago. That there has been much that was hard, unjustifiable and cruel in the relations between the English government and various sections of the Irish population in times past is beyond dispute. But I am so far from sharing the tendency of some of my fellow-countrymen to go down on my knees in sackcloth and ashes in a lamentation over the vileness of my forefathers, that I am bold to maintain that in no country in the world was open, dangerous and prolonged rebellion treated so leniently as in Ireland ; in no country in Europe did religious persecution assume a less deadly, a less vindictive character. It is true that the penal laws in

Ireland were ferocious in form and often oppressive in their execution. But contrast the position of the Roman Catholic in Ireland with that of his anti-religionist in France or in Spain. France indeed had no long and wearing contest with her Huguenots. She cut the Gordian knot: the massacre of St. Bartholomew and the revocation of the edict of Nantes effectually relieved her of the necessity for enforcing penal laws against offenders who had been so effectually removed from her jurisdiction. Spain in the sixteenth century had still less trouble with her Protestants; but then her remedies had been even more drastic: the Holy Office had done its work, and the rack and the stake had cleared Spain of the taint of the heretic.

At no period of our history did England ever attempt to emulate these methods of dealing with an unpopular religion; and where the Roman Catholics were persecuted, either in England or in Ireland, it was because they were (or were honestly believed to be) rebels against the state. It must never be forgotten that over and over again, when England was literally struggling for dear life, foreign armies found ready allies in Ireland. There is not the slightest reason to blame the Irish partisans of Philip and James II for what they did; but still less is there any reason to wring our hands over the fact that English officers did what their strict duty to their country demanded, and overthrew in succession every Spanish or French force which set foot in Ireland, together with its Irish allies.

In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries the whole of Europe was divided into two camps, and Catholics and Protestants were fighting, the former for ascendancy, the latter for existence. A portion of the Irish population elected to throw in their lot with what appeared, and in fact then was, the stronger side. They hoped to win; they intended to win; and if they had won, the cause of liberty would have gone down in England as it went down in Spain, in Austria and in France. But happily they did not win. With her back against the wall, England fought out her own salvation, and as a natural consequence took steps to keep what she had gained.

It is often forgotten that down to the beginning of the present century there was a perpetual menace to England from foreign soldiers landed in Ireland. The date of the disappearance of this danger is the date of the commencement of an entirely new era in the attitude of English statesmen towards Irish disaffection. An alien enemy in arms must be met in arms and destroyed; and those who choose to abet him must take the chance of his defeat and submit to its natural consequences. But the grievances of disaffected subjects can be met by legislation and by parliamentary methods. The history of the English Parliament since the Union is a long record of the recognition by England of this distinction.

The Argument from the Past Conduct of England in Commercial Matters.

It is frequently alleged that the present unfortunate condition of Ireland is due almost wholly to English misgovernment, and that the pressure of exceptional legislation directed against Ireland has been exceedingly detrimental to its people. Granting that this were the case, it of course by no means follows that Home Rule is necessary or desirable. Indeed, there is little causal connection between the past legislation of England and a sudden and complete transfer of all power of legislation from the Parliament of the United Kingdom to a local body in Dublin.

But it is as unwise to accept the bare allegation as to this cause of Irish misfortune as it is to accept any other statement coming from the special pleaders of the Parnellite cause. That up to the beginning of this century penal enactments were in force in Ireland which were obsolete or unknown in England is a matter of history. Some allusion has already been made to the circumstances under which these measures were imposed. But to trace all the misfortunes of Ireland to this source is indeed an absurdity.

That the tenure of land in a province which had so often been the scene of armed rebellion, and in which nearly every

estate had been confiscated at one time or another by the dominant party, should be unsatisfactory to many, was not only natural but inevitable. It must be borne in mind, however, that whatever may have been the extent of the confiscation it was no question of the spoliation of a native race by an alien invader. Both conqueror and conquered, Whig and Jacobite, Protestant and Roman Catholic, were equally aliens as far as their Irish origin is concerned. Many of the present tenants of Tipperary are the descendants of Cromwell's victorious soldiers. Mr. Parnell, himself a Wicklow landlord and representative of a Cheshire family, holds the acres which were bestowed by England on his predecessors. The lines of division in Ireland are not, and have not for centuries been, coincident with those of race; and a proposal to reinstate the real heirs to the confiscated estates of Ireland would, if it were practicable, produce a settlement which would surprise much more than it would gratify the National League. But setting aside these considerations for the moment, it is fair to admit that in Ireland, as in so many other countries where internal conflicts have raged, the conditions of land tenure were economically unsound, and moreover were capable of producing a great amount of harsh and unjust treatment within the limits of the law.

So clear is this, so clear was it to English statesmen, that the present century contains the record of an uninterrupted series of enactments, passed for the purpose of removing from Ireland those inequalities and hardships which the previous policy of England had imposed upon her. One by one, with a celerity probably unequalled in the history of any other country, problems of the most difficult and critical nature were taken up and dealt with. One powerful English ministry after another expended itself in its efforts to remedy the grievances of Ireland — and what has been the result? The result has been that Ireland at this moment stands, beyond all contradiction, in a position which, so far as political freedom, political privilege and the conditions of land tenure are concerned, is absolutely unrivalled in the world. With a considerable over-

representation in the Imperial Parliament, her delegates have not only been allowed to monopolize the time of that assembly, but have been permitted to enjoy within its walls a liberty, and indeed a license, unparalleled in the history of Parliaments. In Ireland itself popular opinion has been permitted to find its expression in ways which in any other country in the world would have been forbidden. And not only has a freedom been extended to the most rabid excesses of speech and writing, but the liberty of the platform and the liberty of the press have been, in the opinion of many, too long associated with a liberty of crime which any other government but that of England would long ago have repressed by armed occupation and martial law. Nor has the great agrarian difficulty been left untouched. On the contrary, it is a simple fact that at this moment there is not in the whole world, either in Europe or in America, a state in which the conditions of an agricultural tenant can compare with those which the law has created in Ireland. Not only has the Parliament of England made up whatever of inequality there may have been in the conditions of the occupier of land in England and in Ireland, but it has now gone further, and has weighed down the scale of advantage on the side of the Irish tenant to an extent which must seem almost incredible to those who still listen to the loud-voiced complaints of the paid Irish grievance-monger.

But, it will be said, all this may be true, but the mischief done by English legislation in the past has left too deep a mark for any concession of this kind to efface it. Ireland is poor, miserable, without manufactures and without capital; and it is to England that she owes her condition. To this contention one word provides a full and sufficient answer: *Ulster*. English laws have ruined Ireland; but *there is Ulster*. English protection has crushed Irish manufactures; but *there is Ulster*. English oppression has destroyed civil liberty in Ireland; but *there is Ulster*. Yes, there is Ulster; a living, thriving fact; not to be got rid of, not to be argued out of existence, but determined to go on in its own way a witness for the truth.

English protection has crushed Irish manufactures. Has it?

It is perfectly true that, up to the commencement of the present century, England, in common with every other nation in the world, adhered to principles with regard to the protection of her home industries, which, if I am not misinformed, are not unknown even now in some great countries. It is true that, acting according to her lights, England taxed the woollen industry of Ulster and practically destroyed it. It is true, also, that years before any other nation had contemplated the idea, and while every other country in Europe was still levying heavy internal contributions, England, under the guidance of a great minister, deliberately elected to take a step in the direction of free trade and to remove the pressure from the products of Ulster. But can it be pretended that the interference with the woollen industry of Ulster has proved her ruin? Obviously not. On the contrary, at this present moment it is in this very Ulster, which has grown up under the same laws as the rest of Ireland, that we find the seat of a great and thriving industry, raised, maintained and extended solely by the skill, honesty and perseverance of the people of Ulster.

Indeed, Ulster presents at this moment a great object-lesson to all those who desire to study the condition of Ireland. Ulster must be seen to be comprehended. There is something in the outward and visible signs of wealth and prosperity and order in that province which is more impressive than any amount of comparative statistics.

It is not unequal laws which differentiate Ulster from Munster, Belfast from Cork; it is and must be something altogether different, for the laws in Ulster and Munster are not unequal, but the same. Beyond question the difference exists, as any one who is acquainted with the two provinces knows well enough. Nowhere in the world is a sharper line of demarcation to be found between two peoples than between the Protestants of the North and their Roman Catholic neighbors. It is not necessary to express or to feel any preference for the spiritual side of either creed, or to attribute a moral excellence to the one at the expense of the other; but it is perfectly easy to compare the external and material circumstances which are asso-

ciated with unerring constancy with the Protestant and Roman Catholic populations in Ireland respectively. There are, indeed, in Ulster, and in all parts of Ireland, thousands of Roman Catholics who have thrown in their lot with the law-abiding section of the community, and who have obtained a full share of the advantages which such an association was certain to afford. But the great fact remains that poverty, distress, law-breaking and crime follow lines which are coincident, not with the operation of any particular legislation, but with the extent and intensity of the Roman Catholic element, wherever that element is sufficiently strong to mould the social condition of the people. The qualities which succeed in Ulster succeed out of Ulster; and there is no peculiarity either in the soil or in the laws of Tipperary and Cork which condemns industry to failure and honesty to extinction. A story used to be told by the late Mr. Forster of a tour which he made through Ireland in company with Carlyle and Mr. (now Sir Charles) Gavan Duffy. Carlyle, no doubt, viewed with no very amiable eye the failures of a population for whose regeneration he prescribed, as the first and essential remedy, a course of instruction in the ten commandments; and it may easily be supposed that Mr. Duffy was not slow in enlarging upon the outrages to which his countrymen had been subjected by the Saxon oppressor. Again and again, as they drove through the country, some little patch of good farming, some comfortable house, some well-drained land or other sign of civilization and improvement caught the attention of the travellers. Again and again inquiry produced the same explanation: some Scotch or English settler, some Northcountryman from Antrim or Down had pitched his tent in the wilderness, and already the wilderness had begun to bloom. Finally, when the same inquiry had once again produced the stereotyped reply, "Ah, Duffy, Duffy," said Carlyle, turning to his neighbor, "it's always the same old story, always the hoof of your bloody Saxon."

Once more, it is *not* the fact that the present poverty and misery of Ireland are due to English law. It is possible, however, without pressing the inquiry very far, to suggest one

cause at any rate which may reasonably be credited with some part of the poverty which undoubtedly exists. It will hardly be denied—and, if it be denied, the most crushing practical proof can be adduced in support of the proposition—that any reasonable man who since the commencement of the Parnellite agitation were to invest money in the South and West of Ireland would be justly accounted a lunatic if the money were his own, and a rogue if it were any one else's. It is not necessary to impress upon American readers the inevitable effect of banishing capital from so poor a country as Ireland. And before going back centuries to find out why Limerick is a decaying city, why credit has ceased to exist in Waterford or Tipperary, it seems reasonable to suggest that the predominance, in those parts of the country which are most depressed, of an association founded on robbery and conducted by the aid of every species of roguery and persecution, may possibly have produced the same effects in Ireland as it would undoubtedly have done in any other part of the world.

The Political Argument.

It is stated in many quarters, and it is possibly believed in a few, that the question at issue between the Unionists and the Gladstonians involves a fundamental difference of opinion with respect to the first principles of government. The most cursory examination of the facts is sufficient to dispel this misconception or misstatement, whichever it should be called. "Every people has a right to govern itself. The Irish are a people; therefore they have a right to govern themselves." This is an unimpeachable syllogism which no one can quarrel with. But—"Every nation has a right to govern itself. The Irish are a nation; therefore they have a right to make their own criminal law, to appoint their own judges and to elect their own Parliament, but *not* a right to levy their own customs, to control their own police, to endow their own religion, or to make their own land-laws"—that is a syllogism unknown to the logician or to the man of sense. From a thousand platforms the Gladstonian demagogue may be heard denounc-

ing the infamy of a party which refuses to Ireland the right of self-government, and yet not one among them all pretends, or ever has for a moment pretended, that it was wise, right, expedient or possible to give to the Irish the self-government they so loudly demand. To descend for a moment from the splendid generalities of platform rhetoric to the actual demands of the most advanced Home-ruler is indeed to fall from the clouds to earth. A mere glance at the schedule of disabilities which Mr. Gladstone himself, in his most sanguine moments, felt bound to impose upon that Irish Parliament which he hoped to create, will enable us to obtain a fair *résumé* of the real state of the case. The levying of your customs; the raising of soldiers, militia and volunteers; the state endowment of your religious institutions; the appointment of your principal judges; the disposal of seventy-five per cent of your revenue; the settlement of your land question,—all these things, said Mr. Gladstone to his Irish friends, you are forbidden to meddle with.

It is not necessary to argue here whether this, that or the other limitation was wise or the reverse. The fact remains that, one and all, they stand on record as a testimony to what is meant by those who solemnly invoke the right of a people to govern itself. That a minister who gave to an Irish Parliament the right to raise troops or to levy custom duties upon English goods would be a traitor to his country, is beyond question. That a British minister who was dishonest enough to hand over the settlement of the Irish land question to an Irish Parliament would be practically compounding a felony, is no doubt equally true. No Unionist is likely to find fault with Mr. Gladstone for keeping within the bounds of ordinary reason and political sanity. But admitting all this, what becomes of the great principle which is supposed to be the rare monopoly of one party? In a moment the question is reduced to its proper proportions. There is *no* party in Great Britain which desires or intends to concede to a portion of the United Kingdom the rights of a nation. There is no section out of Ireland which has the remotest intention of really admitting the principle that what a majority of the Irish people wish for, that they shall

have. Apart from the fine phrases of platform orators, the real situation of the parties may be briefly stated thus :

Both sides admit that, for the sake of good government and order, certain changes are desirable in the form of Irish administration. The Unionists claim that, before all and above all, reasonable steps must be taken to preserve national unity, to secure the absolute supremacy of the Imperial Parliament, and to enforce the law of the land for the protection of honest citizens. Any concession which is not consistent with the attainment of these objects must, they contend, be postponed for the present. The English section of the Parnellites, while professing that they too are wholly unprepared to concede to Ireland national independence, and while ready to suggest all sorts of fancy limitations to the new constitution which they propose to set up, are willing to trust to the theory of chances and to the magnanimity of Mr. Parnell for the fulfilment of those primary conditions on which the Unionists insist.

The "Coercion" Argument.

There is one argument which is frequently addressed to the most ignorant sections of our electorate and which, owing to their imperfect education, has considerable weight with them. It is not one, however, which by any refinement of courtesy can be supposed to be used with any sort of sincerity by reasonably instructed persons ; and it is one which is so little likely to commend itself to Americans that I need hardly do more than allude to it. I speak of the so-called "coercion" argument. The exceptional legislation which the government of Lord Salisbury, following in the steps of that of Mr. Gladstone, has found it necessary to adopt, has one object only ; namely, to protect innocent men against outrage and to enforce the law of the land against organized, openly avowed conspiracy. There is no sort of mystery about the measures which have been adopted. Their chief peculiarity is their extraordinary mildness, and the contrast which they present to the much more drastic legislation insisted upon by Mr. Gladstone, when in office.

But it must be noted that the whole of the outcry which is at present being raised in Ireland, and by the Parnellite Party in Great Britain, is directed against the administration, not because it exceeds the laws passed and recorded by the majority of Parliament, but because it enforces such laws. Were it not for the extraordinary confusion that at present exists in this country with regard to the very first principles of political science, it would be ridiculous to press the proposition that a law must be obeyed till altered, and that any man, high or low, rich or poor, saint or sinner, who deliberately, for his own purposes and acting on his own judgment, sets up a law for himself against the law of the land, must be laid by the heels. But strange as it must appear to American readers, this is precisely the proposition which members of the Unionist party are constantly forced to combat.

With regard to the actual administration of the law in Ireland and the alleged barbarity and injustice of the Imperial officers in that country, of which we hear so much, little need be said. Anybody who has the slightest acquaintance with the Irish method of conducting a political controversy is perfectly well aware that personal attacks on individuals, gross and ridiculous misstatements of fact, and absurd charges against anybody and everybody who chances to give offence are the mere common forms of procedure. The atrocious libels which are directed against Mr. Balfour and against every one of his subordinates are simply the old stale phrases which have done duty scores of times when Mr. Gladstone, Sir George Trevelyan, Lord Spencer or some other minister happened to be in office. The blanks are filled in with another set of names — that is all.

Character of the Irish Parnellites : Argumentum ad Hominem.

In another part of this paper I have stated my belief that little is to be gained by addressing, to those who are not intimate with all the details of our domestic politics, arguments based upon the personal character of the political leaders on either side. The degree of blame or discredit which would

attach to A, B or C for the suddenness of their change of opinion or the supposed betrayal of their associates is a matter of opinion, and cannot be decided upon any universally recognized principles of right and wrong. But there are other classes of offences and other offenders whose case presents no difficulties of this kind, and whose actions it would be impossible to overlook in any review of the situation. There is no necessity whatever to take one step into the region of controversy, to quit for one instant the realm of admitted and undoubted fact, in order to show that the Parnellite organization—the organization, that is, which has created the present demand for Home Rule and to which, in the event of Home Rule being conceded, the chief power in the new administration must be transferred—has been built up and established upon a foundation of cruel felonies, having prepared the way for its present power by the commission of more than twenty thousand brutal and premeditated crimes. There is, as I say, no controversy about the nature and object of these crimes: they have been committed, almost without exception, by persons acting, and professing to act, in the interest and by the instructions of the Land League and the National League, the two bodies which have successively conducted the Irish campaign. More than a hundred of these crimes were premeditated murders. It is constantly stated, in quarters where it is held to be important that such a belief should be entertained, that the murderers were ruined and outraged peasants, driven in a frenzy of despair to revenge their wrongs upon their unjust landlords. 'I am the last person to maintain that, even were this statement in accordance with the facts, there would be any reason whatever to palliate, much less to pardon, the brutalities of this vile crusade. But, as a matter of fact, the allegation is absolutely and entirely false; and inasmuch as the details of the crimes committed are matters of record in the public journals, in the official returns, and in the reported proceedings of the criminal courts, the allegation is undoubtedly false to the knowledge of most of those persons who have made it. With exceptions so rare as to be scarcely worth

mentioning, the victims of the Parnellite movement have been poor and defenceless peasants, who have been murdered simply and solely because they endeavored to do their duty, to pay their debts and to obey the law of the land. So far from it being true that the murderers were men exasperated by ill-treatment and burning for revenge, it is beyond question that they have in almost every case been well-to-do members of the various local leagues who, uniting in gangs of from eight to fifteen in number, have gone from cottage to cottage under cover of darkness with the name of the League upon their lips, professing to act and acting as its delegates, and shooting and stabbing in cold blood every obnoxious person whom it was safe and profitable to molest. Two essential features of all these crimes must never be forgotten. In every case they were committed with the object of making, or avoiding the payment of, money; in every case they were committed against individuals who were defenceless and friendless, and known to be so. To be dangerous, to be capable of resistance, was at all times to be safe. Once only, as far as I am aware, did any gang of Irish murderers wittingly risk their own lives; and that was in the case of the Phoenix Park tragedy. But the assassination of Lord Frederick Cavendish and Mr. Burke, though the work of men who in many ways were bound up with the League, was not, strictly speaking, a League murder, and had none of the characteristics of the far greater villainies which are chargeable against the gangs of Land-leaguers in Westmeath, Cork, Galway, Limerick and Tipperary. Many of the men who organized and perpetrated these crimes are still the leaders and organizers of the National Leagues in the South of Ireland. It is supposed that there is some room for doubt about this matter, but in reality there is none. By far the greater number of these persons are perfectly well-known to the government and have always been known to the central committee of the League in Dublin, who might at any time, had they chosen to do so, have handed them over to the authorities and secured their conviction. It will be asked: Why are these persons still at large? Americans who remember the

history of the Molly Maguire conspiracy will understand what an organized system of perjury and intimidation can effect. It is scarcely wonderful that legal evidence should be with difficulty obtainable in Ireland. A young man attends on *subpœna* to give evidence in a case affecting the Parnellites; he exhibits no hostility towards them, but it is enough that he has obeyed the summons of the law. He is left with twelve bullets in his body to die on the high road. A juror in pursuance of his oath gives a true verdict according to the evidence; he is stabbed almost to death outside his own door. A poor man acts in accordance with a decree of the land court; he is shot dead in his field. Judges, juries and witnesses are coarsely and openly threatened, and gangs of National Leaguers are employed to give reality to the menaces contained in notices and papers. Not only is perjury practised with a skill and completeness which could only be equalled in Bengal, but responsible leaders of the movement actually urge their followers to do all in their power to baffle, trick and mislead both the criminal and civil courts.

Nor, if we leave the performances of the rank and file and turn to the character and attitude of the leaders of the party under whom they serve, is the record more favorable. To go no further than the actual chief of the present agitation, the person whom Mr. Gladstone has recently taken under his patronage and to whom he purposes to entrust the government of Ireland, enough may be said of him, in very few words, to explain why it is that Unionists are reluctant to entrust the lives and fortunes of their fellow countrymen to his keeping.

For nearly ten months there met weekly, round a committee table in Dublin, six men, to whom, at a later period, a seventh was added. These seven men were the principal members of the Land League executive. In the intervals between each meeting, four of them, in accordance with instructions, left Dublin on a tour in the southern and western counties. The work in which they were engaged was usually called "organization" by the League journals. Whatever was its nature, its results were plain enough. Wherever these four confidants and

colleagues of Mr. Parnell passed through the country, their footsteps were tracked in blood. Murders, mutilations, and outrages of every kind followed their visits to each respective locality. From time to time they came back and took their places at Mr. Parnell's council board with their three colleagues. At the end of the period named, a remarkable event took place. The existence of the Land League was threatened. Instantly this band of brothers was dissolved. The circumstances of its dissolution are most singular. A day was spent in destroying those documents which were considered to be compromising and which it was not easy to remove. The travelling members of the committee, against whom there was evidence other than documentary, fled the country and have never returned since. One of them absconded under an unanswered indictment for wilful murder. A second, Mr. Parnell's treasurer, disappeared with the cash and papers, while Mr. Parnell's secretary and one of his chief officers have both run away for reasons which they have not cared to explain. It will be asked: Where are the other three members of the committee? The answer is a simple one. They are at this moment members of the Imperial Parliament and the principal persons to whom it is proposed to entrust the destinies of honest men in Ireland.

It may be suggested that there is some room for doubt as to the correctness of these statements. There is however no room for uncertainty in the matter. Every single one of the facts referred to is a matter of public record, which any person anxious to ascertain the truth can verify without the slightest trouble.

As the leaders are, so are the followers. The twenty thousand outrages which have been committed during Mr. Parnell's period of leadership, the details of which may be studied in all their horrible reality by any one who chooses, were the work of Mr. Parnell's adherents, acting or at any rate claiming to act under his orders, in pursuance of his policy, and in the certain assurance of his support, both moral and material.

The Argument in Terrorem.

One of the least important and least impressive arguments in favor of Home Rule is the argument *in terrorem*, the argument based on a threat, which reckons upon the cowardice of the English people. The argument would scarcely have any weight if it had not, strangely enough, been adopted by one of the most distinguished of the Liberal leaders, namely, Mr. John Morley. That the argument should have weight with men, and more especially with women and children, who, unbefriended and without either the sustaining power of present aid and sympathy or the no less powerful stimulus of perfect acquaintance with the traditions of their country, have been made the actual victims of Parnellite outrages, would not be surprising. There is perhaps more ground for astonishment that with these sorely tried sufferers the argument has apparently but little weight. But it is very singular, and not very gratifying, that the person who is apparently most strongly moved to abandon the plain path of national duty by the threats of Irish-American cut-throats and Irish moonlighters should be an eminent historian and philosopher, who has had the privilege of acting as a minister of the crown. I do not of course mean to impute personal fear to Mr. Morley. I am certain that such an imputation would be in direct contradiction with the facts. At the same time, it is absolutely impossible to deduce from the arguments of the late chief secretary any other conclusion than that it is advisable to surrender because otherwise things may, in Mr. Parnell's phrase, be made "too hot" for us. Mr. Morley has never been at any pains to conceal his opinion of the character and conduct of the men to whom he proposes to hand over the government of Ireland; but he appears to imagine that, when he has pointed out that the enforcement of the Unionist policy means more dynamite explosions in London, more shootings and stabbings in Clare and Kerry, and more ruffianism in the House of Commons, he has said enough to convince the world of the necessity for its immediate abandonment.

Now it is of course obvious that such a doctrine as this,

whether rightly attributed to Mr. Morley or not, ought only to be mentioned to be repudiated by the representatives of any nation which hopes to retain the name. Even if it were true that for years to come the lives of our statesmen and the safety of our homes were to be at the mercy of gangs of ruffians armed with dynamite and the dagger, criminals whom no efforts could detect and no punishment terrify, it would none the less be our duty to go on in our own way, confident that England, of all nations in the world, would be able to live through and to live down a difficulty of this sort. But fortunately there is no need for such gloomy anticipations. The dynamiters and murderers have already more than met with their match; some of them have been hanged, others are in penal servitude, and every one of those still at large is known to the police and has been hunted back to the hole from which he came. As to the persecution by National Leaguers in Ireland, I admit that justice has not yet overtaken the murderers and persecutors of our poor Irish fellow-citizens. But even in that direction progress has been made, and there is every reason for hope that still greater advances may shortly be expected. As to the planned assaults upon the dignity and efficiency of our Parliament, as to the threats so often made to the effect that Irish members would stop the action of Parliament if they could not destroy its machinery, it is satisfactory to note that already all fear on that score has passed away, and the House of Commons has shown itself both able and willing to go its own way despite the most vicious and persistent attacks of the obstructionists.

There is, of course, another and a more important aspect of the argument *in terrorem* which is serious enough, and which it is impossible for Englishmen wholly to ignore. It is contended by some authorities that, in settling their domestic concerns in their own way, the British people are incurring a serious and appreciable danger of an ultimate rupture with the United States. It is impossible for me to say whether such an idea has ever received any practical embodiment in American politics; but there can be no doubt that there is a

considerable party in this country who have used the threat of war with the United States in connection with the Irish demand for Home Rule as a rod to conjure with. Now let me say at once, that for an Englishman, or indeed for a citizen of any country, to speak of a war with the United States as anything but a calamity of the most frightful kind, involving perils far more serious than could possibly accompany hostilities with any other nation, would be to sin against all knowledge. Let me also say that, granting all this and fully aware as I am of the possibilities which such an event might involve, I would rather risk everything upon which our national existence depends than see the affairs of the United Kingdom settled by any other authority than the people of the United Kingdom. And in saying this I am simply claiming on behalf of my own country what every American would claim and always has claimed on behalf of his own.

But while thus admitting that I by no means underrate the extent of the danger if it exists, and while maintaining that if it does exist it is one which must be encountered, I cannot for a moment pretend that I fear such a consummation as that to which I have alluded. I do not believe that the people of the United States have the faintest desire to interfere in a quarrel of which I would say, with much respect, they at present only imperfectly comprehend the nature. Still less do I believe that the sympathy which no doubt exists in the minds of many Americans on behalf of those who are desirous of injuring England is likely to survive that full acquaintance with the real question at issue which time is certain to bring.

Englishmen are of course well aware of the exigencies of American politics, and their own experience is quite sufficient to enable them to understand how heavy a pressure may be put upon the policy of a great party by a well-organized and active minority. At times, it must be admitted, the exigencies of the political situation compel a course of conduct in America which appears to us to exceed the bounds of permissible political action. For instance: were a paper to appear weekly in London in which it was stated that a class would be held daily, at a

given address in the Strand, at which the pupils would be instructed in the manufacture of explosives to be employed for the murder of President Harrison and the members of his cabinet, the destruction of the Capitol, and the sinking of American ships-of-war, it is hard to believe that a feeling of resentment would not arise in the minds of some American citizens. Nor would this feeling of resentment be allayed or diminished by the fact that the President's life *was* actually attempted, and that a portion of the Capitol *was* in fact wrecked by dynamite. Again: were it a fact that in our English papers the names of certain United States magistrates in New York or Chicago were published, with a personal description of them, and with an intimation not only that they were to be murdered as soon as possible but that men had been already despatched to put them to death, and were it also the fact that one of these magistrates was so murdered, and that others only escaped the same fate by never moving without an armed escort, I am shrewdly of opinion that the publication of such papers would be condemned in the United States. Nor do I believe that a statement that the municipal law of England provided no remedy against these practices would lead to any other rejoinder than that it would be a good thing if the municipal law were to be altered. And yet, reversing the positions, there is not a single item in the supposed cases which does not exactly correspond with the actual record of proceedings taken by and on behalf of the Parnellites in the United States and in Great Britain and Ireland. In such instances as these, we in England are inclined to believe that more has been conceded to the necessities of party politics than national comity or good feeling admit.

But as a general rule we are perfectly prepared to abide events, and to rely without fear upon the justice, the honor, and the friendship of the American people. And it now seems probable that whatever influence the purely Irish element may have upon American politics, whether it be for good or evil, has reached its highest point. It is easy to understand why this should be so. At the present moment the most extravagant estimate of that portion of the population of Ireland which is

supposed to be unfriendly to the English connection does not exceed, if it amounts to, three millions—man, woman, and child. It is from the surplus of this population that the anti-English section in the United States must necessarily be recruited. Already in the last ten years the proportion of emigrants from Great Britain as compared with those from Ireland has been completely changed, and the figures of two Irishmen for one Englishman or Scotchman must now be reversed. Add to this the fact that, besides the English and Scotch contingent, the overflow of the great German and Scandinavian populations is pouring across the Atlantic in ever-increasing numbers, and it will be seen that the element which draws its recruits from a body of three millions has but little ultimate chance of maintaining its predominance against one which is reinforced from a population of more than a hundred millions.

It appears, accordingly, that the influence of purely Irish opinion upon American politics is more likely to decline than to increase; and to us in England who cherish nothing but the most friendly sentiments towards the American people, and who believe that the American people as a whole entertains equally friendly feelings toward us, the prospect is one which it is impossible to contemplate without considerable satisfaction.

The Fatalist Argument.

There is an argument which has much weight with those who are unacquainted with the history of their own country or that of any other, and which is based upon the supposed inevitable character of the conclusion which the Parnellites desire. The ill-feeling towards England which undoubtedly exists among a large class in Ireland is pointed to; the bitter expressions of hatred and undying enmity which form the stock in trade of the professional politicians are quoted; and it is declared that animosity so deep seated, a rancor so extreme, can never be appeased save by a general surrender.

The history of every civilized nation absolutely contradicts

this conclusion. The history of England furnishes one of the best examples. Readers of Scott's novels do not need to be reminded of what was the feeling between England and Scotland little more than one hundred years ago, nor that, only 150 years ago, a Scotch army was in Derby. The sentiment of that period remains only in the pages of historical romance. It is not a hundred years since Hoche crushed the rising in the Vendée; and what more loyal population has France than the Bretons? The success of Austrian administration in Galicia proves precisely the same point; while Americans can tell us what has been the fate of those prophecies which, twenty-five years ago, condemned North and South to secular hatred and perpetual separation.

Nations are not made in a day, nor are their differences reconciled in an hour. But they are reconciled; and no one has the right to expect that the enforcement of a policy of national unity upon a reluctant portion of the community must end, or is even *prima facie* likely to end, in failure.

Ulster.

I have already referred to the position of Ulster, but there are one or two important points in that connection which I must not omit to call attention to.

A well-known American once stated in the presence of the writer that, of all the various nationalities which supplied immigrants to the United States, none furnished a contingent which could approach in vigor, ability and character that which came from the North of Ireland. Below the Northern Irishman he placed the Scandinavian, the Scotchman, the Englishman, the German, the Italian in the order named; and at the bottom of the list the Southern Irishman.

It is not necessary to inquire whether the merits of the last-named class were properly appreciated or whether the position assigned them can be reasonably accounted for; but the explanation which the speaker gave of the great excellence of the Ulsterman as an immigrant into a land where

vigor, character and shrewdness are essential to success is worth remembering.

The Ulsterman has for generations been the representative of a powerful race holding its own in the midst of an overwhelming majority composed of a different race and animated by sentiments which were always uncongenial and generally hostile. Like the Magyars in Hungary, the English in India, the Germans in the Baltic provinces, the Ulstermen have not only survived but have succeeded by their force of character; in other words, by being the better men. At no period has the pressure been relaxed, and the qualities which were required to withstand it were consequently at all times exercised to the full.

Whether this explanation be correct or not, the fact remains that Protestant Ulster at this moment is incomparably ahead of the rest of Ireland in strength, wealth, prosperity, respect for law and love of personal independence. While Southern Ireland has been failing and decaying, Ulster under the same conditions has been growing and prospering with a speed and certainty which even the citizens of Chicago and San Francisco cannot afford to disregard.

Now this Ulster is confronted at the present moment by a great peril. Its people are threatened with a fate which they certainly will do their best to avoid. The men of Ulster know well enough that there is not a community from John o'Groats to the Land's End which would submit for a day to the indignity which it is proposed to force upon Belfast, Derry, Carrickfergus and other Protestant communities. No Englishman or Scotchman would trust his own security or a shilling of his own property to such a body as the Land League or to a government formed by its leaders and administered by its methods. Very few Englishmen or Scotchmen are acquainted with the real character of the League (otherwise, indeed, it would long ago have had a short shrift); but Ulster does know it, and with better knowledge there has not come a greater love. Rightly or wrongly, the Northern Protestants believe that to allow Ulster to be taxed and administered by

a Dublin Parliament would be to deliver it over to ruin. They regard the Parnellites as men who, having failed in every honest trade, have earned and are earning a living from the doubtful trade of politics. They believe, moreover, that these men are rightly charged with being principal or accessory to the commission of gross felonies; they know their nominees to have been in trade and traffic with men whose whole life has been devoted to treasonable practices against the country to which they owe their allegiance. They look at Limerick and Dublin on the one side, and they look at Belfast and Lurgan on the other; they compare life in Kerry and life in Antrim; and they say, naturally enough: We decline to become the prey of the men who have done these things and who have produced these results.

Conclusion.

One thing it is most important for Americans, and indeed for Englishmen to remember. No settlement of the Irish question on the lines indicated by Mr. Parnell and Mr. Gladstone can ever be regarded as permanent, or indeed as anything but a temporary expedient to be tolerated for a day and to be swept away the day after by the irresistible logic of facts. Were Gladstonian Home Rule conceded to-morrow, the very next day the impossible nature of the situation would appear. The very day that a Parnellite Parliament is installed in Dublin, the duty of England to protect honest men from its operations will become apparent. During the last eight years, men and women have been persecuted, robbed and murdered in Ireland simply and solely because they were loyal to England, because they obeyed her laws, respected her authority and longed for her success. A section of the English people have during that time allowed themselves to be mystified into the idea that, because they were, or thought they were, responsible for the divisions of Ireland, it was therefore their duty to refrain from punishing those who traded on and perpetuated these divisions. As a matter of fact the attitude

adopted was mean enough; for it cannot be too strongly insisted upon that the full penalty of submission to this self-denying ordinance fell not upon the smug gentry who went to the polls in England to vote for Mr. Parnell, mumbling a confession of their sins and declaring their desire to make any sacrifice to atone for their past wickedness; it fell wholly and exclusively upon their poor and suffering fellow-citizens in Ireland whom they had betrayed and forsaken. But when (if ever) the new régime for which the Parnellites profess themselves so anxious really comes into existence, the miserable excuses with which the English Parnellite salves his conscience will be torn away. Then he will see what is the government and who are the men to whom he has chosen for his own peace of mind to hand over his countrymen.

If one tithe of the offences that have been committed against the loyalists in Ireland, for no other reason than that they tried to be loyal and remain honest, had been committed against British subjects in any foreign country in the world, the people of England would long ago have declared war upon that country and have fought the battle to the last. If Ireland had had the misfortune to be such a country, a three-weeks' campaign would have swept her from end to end and martial law would long ago have reigned from the Boyne to Cape Clear. It is because Ireland is not a foreign country, and because its inhabitants have had the melancholy privilege of being British subjects, that the sufferers in the South and West of Ireland have been so long without relief. But when there is no longer room for self-deception in this matter; when the English electors see, as they will see, that loyal subjects of the British crown are being wronged and robbed by what will to all intents and purposes be a foreign government, — then I firmly believe that they will take heart of grace and will interfere on behalf of their countrymen in a way which cannot be misunderstood. The moment they do so, the Home-rule game is up.

H. O. ARNOLD-FORSTER.

LONDON, January, 1889.